



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

October 31, 2003

Ms. Mary D. Marquez  
Legal/Records Manager  
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
2910 East Fifth Street  
Austin, Texas 78702

OR2003-7846

Dear Ms. Marquez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 190392.

The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Capital Metro") received a request for a specified proposal by Ontira Communications, Inc. ("Ontira") and the related contract between Capital Metro and Ontira. Capital Metro takes no position with regard to the release of the requested information. However, you have notified Ontira and Trapeze Software Inc. ("Trapeze"), interested third parties, of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act (the "Act") in certain circumstances). Capital Metro has submitted the documents at issue to this office. We also received correspondence from Ontira and Trapeze. We have considered their arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that portions of the submitted information have been designated as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert.*

*denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

We also note that the requested contract is subject to section 552.022(a) of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

....

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). Under section 552.022, the submitted contract must be released unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Ontira and Trapeze raise sections 552.102 and 552.110 of the Government Code which are considered "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. Therefore we will address these exceptions accordingly. Additionally, Ontira asserts section 552.104 of the Government Code, and we will address this argument as well. *See* Gov't Code § 552.104(b) (section 552.022 does not apply to information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104).

Ontira asserts section 552.102 of the Government Code in regard to its personnel information. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" This exception is applicable only to information contained in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.--Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision Nos. 473 at 3 (1987), 444 at 3-4 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984). As Ontira's personnel information does not relate to governmental employees, section 552.102 of the Government Code is inapplicable to Ontira's information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Ontira also claims that portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, this section is not designed to protect

the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). Section 552.104 excepts information from disclosure if a governmental body demonstrates that the release of the information would cause potential specific harm to the governmental body's interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). Capital Metro has not argued that the release of submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, Ontira's information may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, Ontira and Trapeze assert section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;

- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Having reviewed the submitted briefs, we conclude that Ontira and Trapeze have established that portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110. We have marked the information that Capital Metro must withhold. However, we conclude that Ontira and Trapeze have not demonstrated that the remainder of their information qualifies as trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We also find that Ontira and Trapeze have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required under section 552.110(b) that the release of the remainder of their information would likely result in substantial competitive harm to them. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release

of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, Capital Metro must withhold only the information we have marked. All remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 190392

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. David J. Mitchell  
Vice President  
Logic Tree  
8400 Baltimore Avenue, S-301  
College Park, Maryland 20740  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Douglas Spaeth  
Director  
Ontira Communications Inc.  
506-1168 Hamilton St.  
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6B 2S2  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sanjay B. Desai  
Contract Administrator  
Trapeze Software Inc.  
2800 Skymark Avenue  
Mississauga, Ontario L4W 5A6  
(w/o enclosures)